



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2013

**Martin Völkl, Muslime, Märtyrer, Militia Christi: Identität, Feindbild und
Fremderfahrung während der ersten Kreuzzüge (Wege zur
Geschichtswissenschaft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011, Pp. 306. €39.90**

Maier, C T

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/118.3.918>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-154443>

Journal Article

Published Version

Originally published at:

Maier, C T (2013). Martin Völkl, Muslime, Märtyrer, Militia Christi: Identität, Feindbild und Fremderfahrung während der ersten Kreuzzüge (Wege zur Geschichtswissenschaft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011, Pp. 306. €39.90. *American Historical Review*, 118(3):918-919.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/118.3.918>

memory of Saladin by Sunni and Shi'a historians, medieval and modern, is particularly illuminating. As el-Mohtar reveals, modern historians have tended to divide along sectarian lines in their treatment of the victor of Hattin and the man who recovered Jerusalem from the Franks. To the modern Shi'a, he was a selfish usurper who killed the Shi'a Fatimid caliph and was responsible for the destruction of this great empire; he is also condemned as a poor general for his failure to defeat the Third Crusade. Such a view contrasts with the near-universal acclaim of Saladin down the centuries in the West, and more pertinently here, from Sunni writers, reflected in the views of Arab nationalists and Islamists alike. El-Mohtar argues that in the medieval age, the division was not at all so clear-cut, with some Shi'a praising Saladin for his justice, nobility and generosity. Yet a few Sunni authors, most notably Ibn al-Athir (d. 1234), an author based in the Zengid heartlands of Mosul, voiced occasional (if a touch overstated here) criticism of his motives, treating Saladin as a self-centered and ambitious man. As the essay shows, modern writers are often steered by their own religious prejudices, and this can lead them to be selective or insensitive in their handling of the medieval material, texts created by men with agendas dictated by more than the Sunni-Shi'a division.

Among the other essays, Jay Rubenstein vigorously dissects the complex ideas within Lambert of Saint-Omer's *Liber floridus* (1112–1120), a work that drew together apocalyptic, historical, and political issues to suggest the events of 1099 had initiated the Last Days, or even that the world was in a phase after the fall of the Antichrist. Jaroslav Folda examines the liturgical commemoration of the capture of Jerusalem as an attempt to encourage recruitment for crusades and for people to support such campaigns. He then shows how the loss of Jerusalem to the Khwarismian Turks in 1244 stimulated production of the first illustrated versions of William of Tyre's *History of Outremer* in the West and suggests that the multiple images of the First Crusade acted as a particular spur to recover it once more. Similarly, the fall of Acre in 1291 prompted illuminators to remind their audiences of the triumph of 1099. David Morris confidently traces the range and development of maternal imagery from the rhetoric of the Investiture Controversy through the call for the First Crusade and down to 1215, when Innocent III spoke of Jerusalem as the mother of all the faithful.

One minor gripe would be the lack of an essay representing the memory or impact of the crusades with regard to Eastern Christianity. That aside, it is admirable and exciting to see the broad-ranging interdisciplinary approaches within this volume brought to bear with such good effect.

JONATHAN PHILLIPS
University of London

MARTIN VÖKL. *Muslime, Märtyrer, Militia Christi: Identität, Feindbild und Fremderfahrung während der ersten*

Kreuzzüge. (Wege zur Geschichtswissenschaft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. 2011. Pp. 306. €39.90.

The history of the crusades is currently experiencing a revival in the German-speaking academic world. In particular, there are a number of younger scholars, like Martin Vökl, who have made aspects of crusading the topic of their Ph.D. theses, thus bringing a distinctly Germanic mode of historical inquiry into a field of study that, in recent decades, has been driven forward and dominated by English-speaking academics. Vökl's study is divided into two main thematic parts. First, he addresses what he calls the identity of early crusaders: on the one hand the ascriptions given by propagandists and commentators of the crusades, and on the other, the self-perceptions of crusaders based on these ascriptions as well as on their own crusade experiences. In the second part, Vökl looks at the conceptualizations and representations of the crusaders' Muslim opponents, who were perceived as enemies and representatives of an alien religion and culture. His main sources are chronicles and letters and, albeit very selectively, charters. Vökl's principal results are hardly surprising, and ultimately there is little that, in essence, has not been said before elsewhere: while propagandists and commentators tended to impose a uniform image of the crusaders as religious warrior pilgrims and soldiers of God fighting for a common cause in the defense of Christendom, individual perceptions and behaviors suggest a much greater diversity of identity among the participants of crusades depending on origin, individual motivation, and personal affiliations while on crusade. The Muslim enemies were generally described using traditional labels of religious foes as pagans and polytheists, and as such, morally and ethically deficient. Fed by crusaders' experiences, a more nuanced picture of the Muslim world as diverse and rooted in monotheism was slow to gain ground and always tended to be overshadowed by crude propagandist messages.

The merits of Vökl's study lie in showing just how diverse the sources describing the First and Second Crusades were when it came to portraying the novel practice of crusading. Yes, broadly speaking there was uniformity of purpose and motivation, but there was also a wealth of individual experience and response reflected in the texts relating to these crusades. Furthermore, Vökl tries to tie his interpretation to research on propaganda and identity in war as general phenomena across different eras of history. This makes it clear that some forms of crusade representation were not only predicated on particular historical contexts but just as much on functional aspects and exigencies of war propaganda generally. Having said this, there are some unexpected flaws in Vökl's approach. First, there is next to no discussion of crusading outside the expeditions to the Holy Land. Although a lot is made of the Second Crusaders' interlude during the conquest of Lisbon, the Reconquista, which became a major focus of crusading in the first half of the twelfth century, is almost entirely neglected as are the crusades against the Wends. Sec-

ond, and this weighs even more, Völkl almost entirely disregards the legal aspects of the discourse and practice of crusading, which played an absolutely pivotal role in the definition and formation of crusading and crusading experiences. In fact, legal aspects profoundly affected the status of participants of crusade campaigns and their self-perception; the crusade has justly been described as a monastery on the move and its army as a church in procession. Whether Völkl purposefully omitted this aspect or whether he was not aware of it, remains an open question, but it is surprising that James A. Brundage's seminal study of canon law aspects of crusading (*Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* [1969]) does not even appear in the bibliography. In general, Völkl's study reflects recent English-speaking research on the crusades very selectively. Other important contributions such as Christopher Tyerman's *The Invention of the Crusades* (1998) or Jonathan Riley-Smith's *The First Crusaders, 1095–1131* (1997), which have a direct bearing on Völkl's subject, are also not mentioned. In addition, some recent works by English-speaking historians cited by Völkl are aimed at the popular market rather than the scholarly community and do not really present original research in a way that lends itself to contributing toward serious academic discourse.

Völkl's book is a welcome work of synthesis that opens up some new avenues toward integrating crusade history into the more general field of diachronic studies of war propaganda. Unfortunately it fails to successfully claim a central place within an increasingly international scene of crusade studies.

CHRISTOPH T. MAIER
University of Zurich

CHRISTOPHER I. BECKWITH, *Warriors of the Cloisters: The Central Asian Origins of Science in the Medieval World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. 2012. Pp. xvi, 211. Cloth \$29.95, e-book \$29.95.

The author of this book claims that a particular way of presenting scholarly arguments as a set of questions about themes and ideas in a text constituted a new “scientific” form of medieval argumentation, which he further claims came from the “East,” and directly from the Muslim world of the late twelfth century. There are ancillary claims about connections to far-eastern locations (including Buddhism and Hinduism), as well as to madrasas. In general, these connections seem exceedingly tenuous, especially as regards transmissions to Europe.

The misleading nature of the book begins in the very first sentence, where Christopher I. Beckwith renames the method (traditionally known as “scholastic”) “recursive.” Certainly the practice of using questions to raise issues and arguments about a text did become “the basic vehicle for the analysis of problems in natural philosophy and theology” (p. 1). Whether or not this method constitutes the “ideal scientific method” is perhaps debatable, but the more important question is the dating of its emergence in Europe. Here Beckwith

seems to dislocate the date so as to make room for his unsubstantiated claim that European scholars learned of the method from Avicenna's *De Anima* (apparently using the question method), which was translated into Latin around 1160–1175. Yet this chronology does not jibe with the historical record, for the most authoritative studies of the question genre (e.g., the works of Martin Grabmann and Hermann Kantorowicz) place its emergence in Europe in the first quarter of the twelfth century. Kantorowicz believed that the European origins were to be found among legal scholars debating questions in Roman law. Furthermore, the question method was intensively used by Anselm of Laon (d. 1117) and his students considerably before Avicenna's book was translated into Latin. Whether or not Peter Abelard's *Sic et Non* method deserves recognition in this regard, he died in 1142.

We know for sure that Peter Lombard used the method (“questions systematically arranged”) in his *Sentences*, published sometime before he died in 1160. Beckwith includes a small appendix on the dating of the translation of Avicenna's book, and even if that date could be shifted to the interval 1152–1166, it could not properly be called a precursor to the work of the many other European scholars (in law and theology) who set off on the path earlier. In addition, *De Anima* (often translated as “On the Soul”) is a difficult work falling between psychology and metaphysics. Beckwith provides no evidence that it actually influenced European theologians, jurists, or natural philosophers with regard to format and use.

An equally problematic set of claims is that connecting madrasas and universities, which share virtually nothing other than being contrasting places of higher instruction. Here Beckwith muddies the waters by focusing on the founding of a “college” in Paris, the Collège de Dix-Huit (1180), that was at best a marginal event, having nothing to do with the origins of the University of Paris. This tack was taken because Beckwith believes that the *architecture* of the College des Dix-Huit is similar “in all particulars” with the “typical madrasa” in Syria of the time. *Colleges* did have buildings, but the “university” of Paris was a floating community that transcended any particular “college” such as the Dix Huit. Furthermore, *if* there was a “center” to the emerging University of Paris, it was at Notre Dame, not Dix Huit. Beckwith's major source on madrasas v. universities is George Makdisi, who long ago pointed out that it was not the founding of *colleges* but the founding of *universities* in Europe that was unique.

Scholars for the last hundred years have noted that universities in their origins were communities, not buildings, whereas madrasas were buildings. Madrasas were not “communities” in the same sense as universities: they were not floating, did not have the same legal status, had no “faculty” nor any formal curriculum, and hence did not issue “degrees.” An individual scholar at a madrasa issued *his* “permission to transit” the particular documents that *his* student had learned and probably had memorized. The University of Paris